



Conservation
Review Board

Ministry of
Culture and
Communications

Commission des
biens culturels

Ministère de la
Culture et des
Communications

4th floor
400 University Ave
Toronto ON M7A 2R9
Tel (416) 314-7137
Fax (416) 314-7175

4e étage
400 avenue University
Toronto ON M7A 2R9
Tél (416) 314-7137
Télééc (416) 314-7175

**RE: CITY OF SUDBURY - INTENTION TO DESIGNATE
FLOUR MILL SILOS - NOTRE DAME AVENUE
SUDBURY, ONTARIO**

Judy Godfrey, Vice-Chairman

February, 16, 1990

Hearing pursuant to Section 29(8) of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1980, Chapter 337 of the Notice of Intention given by the Council of the City of Sudbury to designate the exterior of the Flour Mill Silos, Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury, as being of architectural and historical value and interest under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O 1980, Chapter 337.

Lise Poratto-Mason - Assistant City Solicitor for the owner,
City of Sudbury
Roland B. Jolicoeur, for objectors "Concerned Ratepayers of
St. Charles Street"
Roger Latourelle - Senior Citizens of the Flour Mill
David Theriault
Claudette Fongemy

The Board attended at City Hall, Sudbury, on Friday, February 16, 1990. A public hearing was conducted in order to determine whether the property should be designated as having architectural and historical value or interest.

It was acknowledged by all parties present that the City of Sudbury is the registered owner of the property, and that all procedures stipulated by the Statute had been complied with.

The Board, in accordance with its custom, had the opportunity to view the property and the surrounding area subsequent to the hearing.

Prior to the commencement of the hearing, the solicitor for the municipality made a motion that there was no jurisdiction to hold a hearing as Mr. Temelini had withdrawn his objection and Mr. Jolicoeur, the only other objector, does not have a valid objection as his letter of objection referred to the museum on St. Charles Street rather than the Flour Mill Silos on Notre Dame, and that his letter of objection, stamped August 11, 1989, had been received too late to cause a hearing.

After referring to the wording of the letter of objection (Ex.1,J), and noting that the date stamped on the exhibit (Aug.11), did not correspond to the date Mr. Jolicoeur stated he delivered the letter of objection (Aug. 10) to the City, and that in any event either date was less than 30 days subsequent to July 15, the date of first publication, and in view of the fact that a hearing would have had to take place regardless due to Mr. Temelini's letter of objection, the Board ruled that Mr. Jolicoeur had full status as the objector and had full rights to give evidence and cross-examine witnesses according to the procedures of this Board.

FINDINGS OF FACT: Evidence

The City produced exhibits referring to ownership of the property (Ex. 3. 4), which indicate the silos are situated on City property, and that there is also City ownership beside and behind the silos between the silos and Junction Creek (over which there are rights of way).

The first witness, Dr. Ricardo de la Riva, M.D., resident in the area and alderman for nineteen years, gave evidence regarding the history of the silos. According to Dr. de la Riva, the silos were built in 1910 with four foot thick concrete walls, and in the 1950's the community made efforts to get rid of them to the extent of offering \$25.00 rewards for ideas as to how to demolish them. By 1973, Council and residents decided there was strong community support to keep the silos for posterity as a neighbourhood landmark. Shortly thereafter the community raised a total of \$4,148.00 which was given to the City to purchase the silos. The City purchased the silos for \$5,000, for parks purposes.

In addition, the community arranged the purchase of the CPR lands and created a linear park between Notre Dame Avenue and the silos. As part of a neighbourhood improvement project, a park and a centennial fountain were created in 1983.

As time passed, the silos became more and more a symbol of the area - the landmark of the district - and in the last two or three years it has been the opinion of the local historical society that it be designated.

As well, in association with the Business Association, the area now has the status of "Flour Mill Business Improvement Area" which has applied for funding for a PRIDE project for restoration and improvement of the silos, the heritage museum site and landscaping and street furniture along Notre Dame Avenue.

During this period the citizens renovated and relocated an old house close to the silos, now on St. Charles Street, calling it

the Flour Mill Heritage Museum. Dr. de la Riva stated that most of the community groups are proud to have the silos as their emblem, and use it as a logo for many of their activities.

In cross-examination, Dr. de la Riva admitted that in the early period when the Mayor offered the reward for demolishing the silos, there was controversy as to their value to the community.

The City's second witness, Mr. Carlos Salazar (C.V. Ex. 5), is senior planner and urban designer for the City of Sudbury. He produced Ex. 9A (Tours of the Flour Mill area) and Ex. 13 (Flour Mill site) as the basis for the Reasons for Designation.

Mr. Salazar reviewed the development of the City of Sudbury Secondary Plan, adopted September 22, 1987, pages 2-5, section 2:4a (Land Use Policies for Qualitative Development), "to promote and undertake conservation and rehabilitation of buildings and structures wherever feasible" and "Several significant historical pockets exist which should be conserved and improved to reflect the ethnic character and diversity of the Sudbury community." The area delineated as the Flour Mill, historically contained a significant portion of Sudbury's Francophone community. Today a significant number of the homes and businesses within this district retain this ancestry, language and culture.

The area historically known as the "Flour Mill" is one of these areas and is outlined on Map B (Ex.10) as the Flour Mill French Town. Goals for the area include:

- :implementation of a uniform design theme
- :preserve historical and cultural features (Flour Mill Museum, Flour Mill Silos, Saint-Jean-de-Brebeuf Church)
- :improve Notre Dame streetscape
- :Junction Creek redevelopment
- (map & pp. 7-24) :Commercial and Residential rehabilitation
- :improve landscaping along Notre Dame Avenue and at the Pump House
- :creation of a back lane focus for boutiques and restaurants
- :development of Junction Creek waterway park
- :establishment of a market anchor project (e.g. silos/restaurant/market)
- :improvement of flood control along Junction Creek
- :relocation of Flour Mill Heritage Museum

He also presented as evidence Exhibit 10B - A Feasibility Study for the Promotion of a French Town Concept within the Flour Mill Business Improvement Area - February 8, 1985. This study provides an overview of the history beginning from the Laberge sawmill operation in the 1890's, the construction of the Flour

Mill Silos during 1909 and 1910 for use by the Ontario and Manitoba Flour Milling Company which inspired the change in name by residents of the community from O'Connor Park to the "Flour Mill".

The "French Town Concept" in the Flour Mill, a predominantly French-speaking area of the City of Sudbury as an area of the City with a primarily French theme, is consistent with Section 7-2b. as one of the "ethnic centres".

Provided the area is "succinctly defined and identified", the French Town Concept refers to a theme which would distinguish it as Sudbury's French Quarter. The French Town Concept would establish and reinforce the Flour Mill as the hub of Sudbury's Francophone community.

In this document, reference was made to a "consistent design theme", and "preservation and enhancement of the existing historical and cultural features of the area...". The background of the description of the Flour Mill Silos was on the basis of a study by the History Department at Laurentian University in 1978 which viewed the silos as an important part of the area's farming history, although some concern was expressed that the silos were "eyesores - out of context with the residential and business surroundings." The report (Ex.9A) finishes with the words: "The controversy over whether the silos should be removed still goes on, although it is no longer vocalized in the chambers of City Council. It is true that the silos will never be in context with their surroundings, but this is no reason to destroy them. We have lost too many landmarks for this reason alone." LACAC made a resolution May 11, 1989 for designating for architectural and historical value, with reasons for designation, which was carried.

In addition, the witness indicated that in 1989, the Flour Mill Business Improvement Area had its annual meeting and approved the area for a PRIDE application, 1990-91. Proposed PRIDE projects for "Preservation and Enhancement of Important Public Sites/Structures - \$72,000 for the Junction Creek landscaping/parkette; the Flour Mill Silos - improvements to structure/site; Heritage site - pump station, museum, Centennial Log Cabin - site landscaping and improvements." (Ex.10C, Section 3a)

Mr. Salazar then presented evidence that there has already been public investment in the site, giving photographic exhibits (10E) which show the site enhancements whereby the silos have been painted, have decorative lighting, a park and Centennial fountain added, as well as the purchase of a linear park between the silos and Notre Dame Avenue. This expenditure, he stated, was based on the idea that the silos are the landmark of the community. Regarding the zoning, the witness stated the zoning is light

industrial, but the zoning by-law is 28 years-old, is in process of being made in conformity with the Secondary Plan which takes precedence in his opinion; and that the Secondary plan designation is linear-mixed use for the Flour Mill Silo site. Where small offices and commercial uses have mixed with residential uses, one of the purposes of the mixed use districts is "to protect stable residential areas and predominantly residential sections of arterial roads from the intrusion of incompatible uses" (Ex. 10, pp.2-28). The zoning by-law appears to show the Heritage Museum area of 3 lots zoned R3, and the secondary plan designation as Old City Residential.

In this area, the number of residential dwelling units permitted are regulated by the existing lot size and zoned as follows:

- . lots no greater than 324m - one single family dwelling unit
- . lots no greater than 432m - single family dwelling, duplexes, or semi-detached dwellings
- . lots larger than 432m - a maximum of four attached dwelling units provided that the density standard of 140m land area per unit can be met
- . For infilling or redevelopment, normal standards of the zoning by-law shall apply. (Ex.10 pp.2-21; 2-22)

In summary, the witness stressed that the designation of the Silos conforms to the Secondary Plan policies regarding historical preservation and community improvement policies for the flour mill area; the Secondary Plan allows the Municipality to designate historical or architectural significance; the Flour Mill Silos represent early industrial and agricultural culture of Sudbury; it is a cultural landmark for the community at large in Sudbury; that although the "reasons for designation" emphasize historical and cultural importance, the silos are also important from an architectural standpoint as, being the only silos in this area they are unique; and that the Business Improvement minutes of August 28, 1989 Ex.6) state the silos should be kept as a historical site for posterity.

The witness stated the intention is to preserve the character of the structures. The City generalized in the "reasons" so as not to preclude any use, however they made no mention in the "reasons" of anything painted on the silos, although there had been a sign there at one time.

Mr. Jolicoeur, in cross-examination established from the witness that there was some unhappiness voiced about the designation; that the Secondary Plan involved public participation involving both opposition and support, but that the support outweighed the opposition and that it is Mr. Salazar's mandate to carry out the Secondary Plan.

The third witness for the City was Mr. Raymond Prevost, Chairman of the Flour Mill Business Improvement Area and Manager of la Caisse Populaire Saint-Jean-de-Brebeuf. He established that he was present and chaired the meeting and the discussion that took place and Ex.6 are true copies.

He stated he has lived in Sudbury all his life; that the Flour Mill Silos are a heritage landmark of the agricultural past of the Sudbury area in contrast to the importance of the mines, that both his father and grandfather were farmers and had grown wheat for the Silos, and that he, personally, was proud of the silos.

Secondly, as General Manager of the Caisse Populaire, he stated that any documents, annual reports, 25 and 40 year historical documents have all had as their logo the Flour Mill Silos (Ex.12). His establishment, which sits "in the shadow of the Silos" are proud of them, referring to their establishment as "as solid as the silos". For the 25th Anniversary, La Caisse erected a miniature (8 foot high) model of the silos at the corner of Kathleen and Notre Dame in a small park as a commemorative plaque (photo, Ex.12A).

La Caisse Populaire have been contributors to the Business Improvement area; they are interested in beautifying the area known as the "Flour Mill" and would hate to see another "demolition contest" but would rather see a contest to restore or embellish them.

His evidence is that La Caisse Populaire is 100% behind the designation, as is the Business Improvement Area, and that he was not aware of any one who would not want to "stand in the shadow of the Flour Mill", and that he "wants children to see the testimony of the area's agricultural past".

In cross-examination, Mr. Prevost stated in response to questions that the BIA has never financed "shacks" or any museum, that he made the presentation for the "Pride" provincial program for \$212,000 which the City supported which Mr. Jolicoeur stated he was not able to be heard at.

The fourth witness for the City was Father Andre Girouard, editor of Le Voyageur, a Sudbury newspaper. Father Girouard presented copies of former editions of Le Voyageur (Ex.14). He recapitulated the past showing the change from wanting to demolish the silos to one of wishing to restore them, following the public's growing appreciation that one does not have to destroy the core of the City in order to become "modern" - that lessons have been learned through the loss of a significant hotel and the old post office, and that now it is appreciated that one must keep monuments as witnesses to the past, and that the Flour Mill Silos should become such a monument.

Father Girouard stated there has been an evolution since the 1960's when Ontario Francophones viewed Quebec as their fatherland, to the appreciation in the 1970's that their birthplace is Ontario and that Franco-Ontarians belong to Ontario's heritage. During the 60's and 70's the Flour Mill - "a piece of very strong cement" became part of their imagination as evidenced in the painting of the flour mill on the cover of a new book, and recently in the design of a home for seniors on Notre Dame which is reminiscent in concept to the architecture of the silos.

He stated that four or five years ago lectures were published with a picture of the flour mill as a logo, and that at that time it was said that "everyone in Sudbury knows what the silo is about--it is [to Sudbury] like the "Tour Eiffel" in Paris.

He stated that when a building becomes part of the art and poetry of a place, it becomes historical. He has no hesitation in supporting designation of the silos.

Father Girouard gave (as Ex. 13), a copy of *Le Voyageur*, 27 September 1989, in which an artist, Raphael Milkovitch, depicts the Franco-Sudbury history from the voyageurs and fur traders in contact with the Indians as the first settlers; the arrival of the first train to Sudbury; the first Eglise-Sainte-Anne; the pioneer workers in the mines, forest and on the land (agriculture). He felt the silos could become an architectural monument which would be an enrichment to everyone - a Sudbury attraction.

The next witness, Mme. Claire Pilon, a freelance journalist for the Sudbury Star and *Le Voyageur* and author of the book "Le Moulin a Fleur" c.Ottawa, 1983 (Ex.11) gave evidence. She stated that when interviewing "Flour Mill" senior citizens for the book, she found the silos were a very important part of their history - they had watched them being built; played in and around them; had benefitted from them economically. A Francophone, Napoleon Martel had conceived and overseen construction of the Mill and silos and most workers and residents were Francophones. The "red houses", the last remaining one of which was moved, became a "heritage museum" on the pump station site on St. Charles Street, when the property on which it had originally stood was developed as a doughnut shop.

The site on St. Charles Street contains the old pumping station or sewer lift station (built after the first war); a "centennial (1983) log cabin" built for Sudbury's Centennial and moved adjacent to the pumping station; the "red worker's house"/heritage museum moved from its original site behind and beside the silo area when the doughnut shop was built on its original location; and another old house which sits behind and on the same lot as the "red worker's house/museum".

The row of "red houses" were originally erected simultaneously as houses for the mill workers along the scenic but dangerous Junction Creek. It was Ms. Pilon's evidence that the silos instill a sense of pride and belonging; unite the community; that their huge size and presence have played an important part, outlasting their use; and that they have become a landmark which identifies the French area "Le Moulin a Fleur". The fact that there was such an effort by the community in the 1970's to keep the silos as a monument reinforces this importance, as well as the use of the silos in area logos and pictures hung in prominent community locations. It is her opinion that the community wants the silos retained and their setting beautified, and that without the silos the ward would have another name.

The objector, Mr. Roland Jolicoeur, then gave evidence. Although Mr. Jolicoeur is not a professional he was a trade union representative for many years. Both of his grandfathers worked in the Flour Mill. His family has deep roots and connections of long-standing with the people of the "Flour Mill" which has a rich history in the community and an important place in their hearts and minds.

Mr. Jolicoeur stated that there has always been a bone of contention in the community that the flour mill silos lacked real heritage value, giving as evidence (Ex.16), an article in the Sudbury Star on May 19, 1982, just prior to Sudbury's centennial when areas were being named to memorialize historic figures and development milestones. In referring to the proud history of the predominantly French-speaking community which lives in that section of Sudbury, the editorial stated that the "name the Flour Mill projects nothing of a proud history. It comes simply from a business enterprise in the early part of the century which was a resounding failure."

The old silos remain as a landmark (and something of a local joke from their alleged resistance to demolition plans in the past). If Council seeks to mark Sudbury's real heritage, surely a better name could be found. One suggestion might be to rename the Flour Mill neighbourhood in line with its parish church and call it the "Brebeuf section".

Mr. Jolicoeur represents the Concerned Ratepayers of St. Charles Street, some of whom were too ill to attend this hearing, who oppose both the designation of the silos as well as the present location of the "heritage museum" within their residential area, which in their opinion is "one too many, if not two". His evidence is that the Concerned Ratepayers of St. Charles reject them completely and in their entirety and want them removed. He objected to the City in 1985 regarding the \$40,000 it cost taxpayers and opposes any future grants to support these sites.

He stated that in the case of the "Heritage Museum" and other buildings, they were moved to the pump station site on St. Charles Street without consultation and that taxpayers have been disregarded and ignored. Regarding the Heritage Museum itself, it was his evidence that the house was given to the City for one dollar, to save demolition costs, but that other, better houses had been demolished.

He stated that the Concerned Ratepayers of St. Charles Street feel "bullied and stepped all over" regarding the imposition of these heritage structures on their street; that the ratepayers on the street, who own and maintain their homes well (many of whom are pensioners), feel preyed upon.

Mr. Jolicoeur's evidence is that there is nothing architecturally or historically valuable about either the silos or the "shacks" on the St. Charles Street site - that they are historical only in that they are still standing.

The Concerned Ratepayers of St. Charles Street are asking for equal opportunity to be heard on this issue. It is their opinion that public money could be better spent than on these heritage sites. Examples of other public funding priorities to benefit those living in the community, would be such things as restoring the Father Le Mieux building and providing homes for the homeless or battered women.

Mr. Jolicoeur referred to old rusty mine equipment on the heritage site as well as submitting photographic evidence (Ex.18) of the derelict condition of the houses which are part of the "heritage site" which, he feels, the Chief Inspector of the department refused to inspect. He indicated that the property on St. Charles Street is made up of three lots: #398, on which are two houses; #399, on which the old pump house sits; and lot #400 on which the Centennial log cabin is partially located (Ex.19).

In cross-examination, Mr. Jolicoeur stated he spoke for approximately fifteen ratepayers on St. Charles Street and that the others on the steering committee were unable to attend the hearing. He reiterated that it was his opinion that the silos are tied in with the heritage houses on St. Charles Street and that the Museum is at least 200-500 feet from the silos. He also repeated his opinion that for the Ratepayers of St. Charles Street, the City does not have enough historical evidence to proceed with designation.

There was one member of the public who gave evidence, Ms. Claudette Fongemy. It was Ms. Fongemy's opinion that, regarding the silo site, the "red houses" used to be on the lot where the silo is; and that she would prefer to have the Museum, not on St. Charles Street where it is at present, but where the silo is. It was her feeling that the pump house site is "sad" -why put the

Museum there? The problem in her view is the location of the "Heritage Museum" which she feels is an example of bad planning as there is no parking lot on St. Charles Street in addition to other problems. It would be far better in her view if the silo and Museum were close and could be seen together. There is land behind the silos (PART 7, Ex.3,4) where the house could be relocated. It was Ms. Fongemy's evidence that the pumping station, owned by the region, also does not fit in properly in a residential area.

SUBMISSIONS:

The City reiterated Dr. de la Riva's statement of the long-standing neighbourhood involvement with silos, both monetarily and as a physical presence. Mr. Carlos Salazar's architectural evidence was that while the structures did not have traditional architectural value, the silos were a unique structure which gave them architectural value. The wording of the architectural Reasons for Designation were general so as to protect the character of the structure itself.

Mr. Prevost's evidence was that the historical past of the silos is prominent in the area and that the silos represent the area's agricultural past.

The City's submission is that the designation should be approved, and the silos should remain as a symbol of the area; a landmark of the district of Moulin a Fleur since 1910.

The objector reiterated that he was proud and happy to be a lifelong resident of the "flour mill" and making his own contribution to the district. He stated that taxpayers have a right to voice their concerns and that it is the responsibility of a community to have "compassion on the guy next door--that it is the responsibility of the community to do this, not merely to impose its will without regard to those on whom community decisions impact on mostly (i.e. the guy next door)." He reiterated that, when the Concerned Ratepayers of St. Charles Street objected, their input was ignored and the method of decision-making about heritage matters by Council in Moulin a Fleur has created a division between neighbours which shows a lack of consideration.

He stated there is more than one way to confirm an area's heritage, and that in his opinion the silos should have been demolished with a different type of monument or plaque erected.

He stated that one does not have to agree with this method of heritage preservation to be "truly Francophone", and that criticism of a different position should not divide a community and ostracize those with a different approach. There should be

room in the Moulin a Fleur community for a diversity of opinion within the Francophone population.

He stated that this singling out of those with a minority opinion is not warranted in a free country and that elected representatives do not always speak for all their constituents.

In closing, he reiterated that he was not the only objector but only the representative of the "Concerned Ratepayers of St. Charles Street", and with great personal effort and despite very negative pressure from others in the Francophone community and the organized bureaucracy, he was legitimately expressing the dissenting view. He reflected on how, when he was young, the name "Flour Mill" had carried a very negative image among areas surrounding it and he felt that by designating the Flour Mill Silos as a landmark this negative perception would be preserved, rather than a more positive image such as Brebeuf. He expressed concern that the Flour Mill might become merely commercial like "Yorkville" or "New Orleans". It is his opinion, in summary, that the "Flour Mill" has no culture in it and should be renamed, and that the silos should not be designated for architectural or historical reasons.

FINDINGS OF FACT: SUMMARY

General:

- The City is the owner of the silos and considerable surrounding property as well as the neighbouring CPR lands, with some rights of way in favour of others.
- The subject site is zoned light industrial.
- The City purchased the property to retain the silos for parks purposes, with funding raised largely by the "Moulin a Fleur" community.
- The silos and "Heritage (Museum) site" are part of the PRIDE Application for the Flour Mill Improvement Area. There has already been public investment in the site.
- Both the Secondary Plan and background studies done for heritage designation of the site have been long-standing projects of the City of Sudbury and reflect the "French Town Concept" as one of the ethnic areas of the City of Sudbury.
- The silos were once part of a larger complex which included a large flour mill and workers' houses, the last of which has been relocated to the pumping station property on St. Charles Street, (a residential street of privately owned and well maintained homes), where it sits in somewhat poor repair on the same lot as a second house, (in an area zoned

R3), and adjacent to a pump station, 1980's relocated Centennial log house, and rusty mining equipment.

- The community previously wanted the silos demolished and attempts were made to do so, but has now changed its mind and wants them preserved.
- There was some evidence that there may be more important public and heritage spending than the flour mill silos.

Architectural and Historical:

These objectives for designation are within the guidelines of the City of Sudbury Secondary Plan.

Architectural

The silos have formed a strong visual reference point for the community since 1910.

- The silos, a four foot thick reinforced concrete, visually prominent structure, is unique architecturally as they are the only ones in the area.

Historical

- Since 1910, while the mill was in operation, the silos were used agriculturally as part of the important early farming of the area before it became known for mining.
- The silos have been a witness to the growth and change of the City of Sudbury in the context of the "Moulin a Fleur" area, and have been a long-standing historical reference point immortalized by a miniature "model", community logos, poetry and art.
- The Moulin a Fleur community once had a more negative self-image but that has changed to a positive view of itself as a community of Franco-Ontarians as part of Ontario's heritage, separate from Quebec. The community is seeking a monument to a new, more positive identity in Sudbury.
- The silos have historical significance to many in the local community and instills in them a sense of belonging.
- There was a suggestion that a plaque or other method could express the history of the silos to greater advantage than designation and refurbishment.
- There was some public sentiment that the silos as an historical monument would be more fully expressed if the original worker's house, now a museum, were relocated adjacent to the silos to form a more integrated focal point for the community. Better planning and amenities (such as parking), should enhance appreciation of the entire site.

SUGGESTIONS ARISING OUT OF THE HEARING

The Board acknowledges that there is a pervasive local sentiment regarding these silos which has been considered a focus for the community identity for the "Moulin a Fleur" Francophone community. The Board has been given no evidence for any other property in the area to equal the silos, in terms of this "identity", but reference has also been made to the fragmentation of this image due to the relocation of the "red house" of the heritage museum, (which originally formed part of the flour mill complex as a worker's home associated with the mill itself), on St. Charles Street rather than in context behind the silos.

It is the opinion of this Board that, to preserve the heritage of Ontario, the ideal situation is to preserve properties on site, which gives them their proper historical context and forms a true opportunity for all of us and our children to learn about the reality of our heritage. By placing the "red house/museum" on St. Charles Street rather than demolishing it, the City of Sudbury has indeed retained the structure but has not retained its heritage. The Board agrees with the statement in the Secondary Plan for the City of Sudbury (p.7-24), Ex.10C, "Public Market Alternative B" and Ms. Fongemy that there should be relocation of the Flour Mill Heritage Museum to a location beside the silos near Junction Creek, on City owned property. This will place it, if not in its exact original context, in the location of one of the similar workers' houses now demolished behind the silos, at which point it may be appropriate to designate it as well. Removing it from the lot it shares on St. Charles Street with another house would also correct its apparent status of non-compliance with the present zoning by-law on a street with one single family home per lot which the City certainly only anticipated as a temporary situation. (If the "Heritage Museum" does remain on St. Charles Street, there should be a rezoning application with proper notice provided, including notice to those closest and most effected. The public meetings held could determine if two houses should be allowed on one lot on St. Charles Street).

The Board was not able to determine the history or original location of the second old house behind the "heritage museum" but, if it is of historical value, an attempt should be made to return it to a contextually appropriate setting (which should be on St. Charles Street if indeed it was originally sited there), or in the context of the silos, only if there is the historical background to warrant its relocation there.

The Centennial log house shares a different period of history, if indeed it is yet history, to the other structures moved to St. Charles Street and so causes the "heritage site" to begin to lose any sense of historical integrity, having no "consistent design theme", but rather to appear a holding ground for buildings whose

true heritage is elsewhere. The Centennial log house, (if left on site, assuming the removal of the two heritage houses to more historically correct settings, might remain on St. Charles Street as a community facility to serve a social purpose such as a meeting place for seniors, a home for the disadvantaged, or after-school day care for working parents, with proper zoning procedures carried out to ensure its new use complies with area land use provisions. It should not be considered "historic" without LACAC review.

As presently sited, all three buildings demean the quite attractive pump station, a functional necessity which appears to have been sensitively designed quite early to blend successfully into its residential setting. As such it is a good architectural lesson in how to integrate public works visually into their community context.

The old mining equipment seems an anachronism away from the mine from which it was used and would be more illustrative in a mining-related setting elsewhere in Sudbury unless it was used in the Moulin a Fleur area itself, or by the people of Moulin a Fleur. If it is in fact related to the local area, appropriate interpretive exhibits would enrich rather than demean its presence as it now is perceived as being an unexplained artifact on a piece of residential land.

The Board is in agreement with the Francophone community of Moulin a Fleur that there should be a landmark which symbolizes their emerging identity as Franco-Ontarians with long-standing roots in the Sudbury area, with due recognition also given to other ethnic groups who participated in the area's history. The Flour Mill Silos would be a fitting landmark around which to build this focal point, however great care and long term planning should be used to ensure that the end result of this landmark is an integrated cultural whole - a "consistent design theme" (EX.10B) and not a fragmented collection of pieces indecipherable to those who have not grown up "in the shadow of the flour mill".

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Ontario Heritage Act is in place to preserve the heritage of Ontario. The Board recommends that, as an architectural landmark, the flour mill silos should be designated as they are unique in the area and have been a visual landmark in Sudbury since 1910.

The Board also recommends that the flour mill silos be designated for historical reasons, but that great care and well-thought out planning should be undertaken to ensure the integrity and scope of the significant Franco-Ontarian heritage they represent.

Upon consideration of the evidence given at the hearing, and taking into account what was said in summary by the Counsel for the City of Sudbury and by the objectors, it is the considered view of this Board that the Council of the City of Sudbury has acted in the best interests of the community in designating the Flour Mill Silos, Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury.

We therefore recommend that the property in question should be designated by by-law under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act as being of architectural and historical value and interest to ensure its preservation, with the proviso that a plan be prepared by the City of Sudbury showing the subject property and the exact area of land which is to be designated.

(Original Signed by

Judith Godfrey, Vice-Chairman